

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 and 57-62 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated February 21, 2007, claims 1-37 and 57-62 were rejected. Applicants address the Examiner's comments below.

Applicants are amending claims 1 and 57 in this Amendment and Response. These changes do not introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,226 to Ishikawa. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A printer for printing time-based media, the printer comprising:
a media processing system embedded within the printer for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media;
an electronic output system for producing a document on a media from the electronic representation of the time-based media;
a housing for supporting an interface for transferring the time-based media between the printer and an external processing system, and for supporting the electronic output system in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation; and
a resource allocation module embedded within the printer for determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system, wherein the resource allocation module controls the external processing system to process the one or more tasks.

Claim 57, as amended, recites:

A method for printing time-based media in a printer for printing time-based media comprising a media processing system for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media, the method comprising:

receiving user input indicating selection of one or more media processing resources from among resources of the printer and an external processing system;

determining by the printer, processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system, wherein the printer controls the external system to process the one or more tasks; and

determining the electronic representation of the time-based media using the determined allocation of resources.

Sugiyama is directed to a video printer, while Ishikawa discusses a printing system that contains a “dumb” printer and parallel processors. Neither reference, nor the combination as suggested by the Examiner, discloses or suggests a printer having “a resource allocation module *embedded within the printer*” or “determining *by the printer*, processing allocation for one or more tasks among *the printer* and the external processing system.” Furthermore, neither reference discloses or suggests that the printer, or a resource allocation module embedded within the printer, “**controls** the external processing system to process the one or more tasks.”

The Examiner acknowledges on page 3 of the Office Action dated February 21, 2007 that the video printer in Sugiyama does not disclose a resource allocation module for determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and an external processing system. (Sugiyama, Fig. 1). The Examiner states that the “external system” in Sugiyama is the device from which the video signal originates, such as a video or still camera. (Sugiyama, col. 3, lines 12-26). The camera discussed in Sugiyama is therefore not a *processing* system and the printer does not *control* the camera to process one or more tasks.

The Examiner relies on the Printing Job Division Means (9) in FIG. 1 of Ishikawa as disclosing a resource allocation module for determining processing allocation. However, the Printing Job Division Means (9) is not *embedded within the printer* as required by claim 1 and the processing allocation is not *determined by the printer* as required by claim 57. Rather, the Printing Job Division Means (9) is within the First Client Processor (1) which is a device *external* to the printer (2).

The Printing Job Division Means (9) also does not determine processing allocation *among the printer* and the external system. Ishikawa states that the processing can be allocated to a group of parallel processors, but does not describe allocating processing *to the printer*. (Ishikawa, col. 6, lines 6-44) Instead, the processed data is only sent to the printer *after* the processors process it and the printer in communication with the resource allocation module *cannot* do any processing. (Ishikawa, col. 6, lines 6-44.) See printer (2) in Fig. 1.

Even assuming *arguendo* that the references could be combined to replace the “dumb” printer of Ishikawa with the media processing printer of Sugiyama, the combination still would not disclose or suggest the claimed invention, because the combination lacks a printer or a resource allocation module embedded within the printer that *controls an external processing system to process one or more tasks*. Furthermore, the claimed limitation would not be obvious in view of the references because there is no disclosure or suggestion to include the resource allocation module *within the printer* rather than external to the printer as disclosed by Ishikawa. It would not be obvious to have a resource allocation module embedded within the printer because networked printers conventionally operate as slave devices. Thus, conventional printers teach away from a printer that allocates processing tasks to an external processing device.

Thus, the deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. A *prima facie* showing of obviousness requires (1) some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference, (2) a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the reference(s) teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As discussed above, the references do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 57 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

As claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are also patentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa, both alone and in combination for at least the reasons recited above.

In the 4th-15th paragraphs of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa in various combinations with an article entitled “*Using MPI- Portable Parallel Programming with the Message-Passing Interface, second edition*” to Gropp; U.S. Patent No. 6,308,887 B1 to Korman; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent No. 5,936,542 to Kleinrock; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 B1 to McCarthy; U.S. Patent No. 5,170,935 to Federspiel; U.S. Patent No. 5,940,776 to Baron; and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent No. 5,270,989 to Kimura; U.S. Patent No. 5,136,363 to Takemasa; U.S. Patent No. 4,734,898 to Morinaga; and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,030 to Steinberg.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed. For example, none of the above cited references disclose or suggest a printer having “a resource allocation module *embedded within the printer*” or “determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among *the printer* and the external system.” Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-37 and 57-62, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants’ representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

PETER E. HART, ET AL.

Date: May 17, 2007

By: /Jennifer R. Bush/

Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200